



- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS



The Price of Freedom is Eternal Vigilance

Vol. 62 No. 21

5th June 2026

IN THIS ISSUE

What is the Purpose of a Budget? By Neville Archibald

1

What is the Purpose of a Budget? By Neville Archibald

For most of us it is the intention to see that we do not spend more than we earn, to keep within our means. If we must overspend or have a deficit that cannot be avoided, we must find extra money from somewhere. That could be an overdraft, a loan or another job.

Government – not exactly known for its ability to keep within its means – seems to treat the taxpayer as a never-ending resource of ready funds, via new or increased taxes. Policies espoused before an election are often sweetened by promises of tax breaks or even the supposed promise of not introducing or increasing taxes. In the aftermath of a change of government or even after re-election we seen these ‘promises’ relabelled as ‘a change in policy’ or just downright ignored. In this regard we have seen the ‘never ever GST’ (Liberal) and the Keating government’s 1993 budget when Labor abandoned the infamous ‘L-A-W’ tax cuts.

The most recent reversals of course should be well known, even the mass media have mentioned them.

These include: (Google synopsis re: Sky News.)

- Negative Gearing: Labor reversed its promise not to touch negative gearing. The government announced that, effective immediately, negative gearing will only apply to newly built homes, though it grandfathered investments held before May 12, 2026.
- Capital Gains Tax (CGT): The government scrapped the 50% CGT discount (which it previously ruled out altering), replacing it with a cost-base indexation and a 30% minimum tax rate.

- Trust Taxation: Despite pre-election reassurances, Labor announced plans to introduce a 30% minimum tax on discretionary trusts, beginning July 1, 2028.

This is; however, not the thing that causes most issue with me. Broken promises seem to go with party politics, like a walk with your dog requires the carrying of a plastic baggie. No, the thing I dislike is the ambiguity of the budget bill itself. Being just passed in the House of Representatives, it now goes to Senate for its next stage. All this time the ramifications are still being discussed and people on both sides are unsure of the final impacts being made. This is being shrugged off as something that can be tweaked as they go. The bill passes, and then the details will be left to the department to 'figure out'.

Channel 9 interviews Jim Chalmers (our Federal Treasurer) and he is asked about working out the details of the bill later. His response is very Tom Jones, in that ***'it's not unusual .. in tax legislation for the definitions to be settled in what's called, legislative instruments'*** and while he admits those instruments are disallowable by parliament, I still get the feeling that we are expected to accept this planning on the go. Not having parliament voting on definite changes, but more like intentions, that we may have to fight to stop later (which I see as less than optimal). This means that these changes will end up being enacted, and if they are detrimental, the process of removing them will be difficult. All laws, once enacted, might be changed a little, but each respective government rarely ever overturns them once the hard part (getting it through parliament) has been done (the money is too good).

The interviewer, Sarah Abo, also questions some of the figures used for the modelling, which were from 1991, what's the go there? Chalmers didn't really counter it – seems a bit of a slip – I guess he realises that those figures are 35 years old? Many alterations have happened since then! Must be alright though, he sort of breezed over it (sarcasm). Watch it yourself here:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Tz1OOLTeKxE>

Treasury itself doesn't see the budget improving productivity or boosting the economy and the public is also dubious, but as I said, my concern is the acceptance of an incompletely thought out set of tax alterations – as this seems to be. Government by discretion rather than by vote in parliament.

In AI news

Several of the bigger companies out there are now finding out that the cost of AI replacing people, is working out to be greater than just staying with that personal touch. Microsoft and Uber are both finding that out, Nvidia also admitting that the **cost** of AI often outpaces the salaries of the human employees

it replaces. Could it be that Greed might be the downfall of greed in AI?

Despite that, the rate of construction of these Data centres is staggering, across the world it is almost comparable to the 'space race', or the cold war arms build up. Australia is fast tracking approvals country wide, in some cases without the public really knowing what it means. The story is breaking as I write and it is becoming an issue to watch out for, perhaps a discussion to partake in.

A surveillance state depends on Data collection and processing, far from just being a means of making funny cat memes, or all that other 'me me indulgence' that so many find important, these will enable control of us by whatever means our government foists upon us.

I believe that the testing during COVID (of contact tracing, digital permissions and digital vaccine passports) showed the inability of the current processing facilities to cope with total surveillance. They now know they must up the ante to have it successfully integrated, and they must do it before we realise why – thus the fast tracking and enabling support it receives.

What we wish to do about this future is in our hands ultimately, we need to let our elected officials know! We need to bring the discussion to the fore in our communities, not just for the mainstream media reasons of electricity and water use, but for the danger it poses to our freedom.

The use of Cognitive Dissonance.

Cognitive dissonance is having two beliefs that are contrary. Often we accept these beliefs (or are asked to) because it is easier to do so than to actually look for the real truth. Engineers who are asked to manage water storage facilities and flows, yet must act as if the 'bathtub' can hold more than it is capable of. Farmers will know about this, as since speculation was introduced into the irrigation system, investors seem to 'carry over' water assets into the next year or the year after (waiting for a better price when they sell it on to the real user), thereby reducing the ability to use actual seasonal availability to best advantage. While we always had some 'carry over', recent floods, I suggest, have more to do with keeping storages far too full (for these financial reasons) than any 'excessive' rainfall events – but what would I know.

Full employment is another example, where we increasingly push for labour saving devices and mechanisation, yet cannot seem to put unemployment in a positive light. Monetary needs are not being met for those replaced by labour savings, but the product to be bought is still being made. The answer is 'looking for other work', which only makes more material to be purchased (unless it is a 'make work, not product for sale' job). This in turn is also soon mechanised, as we find ways to improve, adding once again to more product, less wages. The lack of money in wages is obvious, but the disconnect with the increasing amount of

product made is never mentioned – we put it in the too hard basket or believe the economists’ versions of truth, despite the ever rising missing money (debt). All this excess product that we cannot afford to buy, must be exported (or dumped). The creation of leisure, far from being the good thing you would expect, puts us into poverty instead.

Climate change, the ever changing weather, once a safe daily topic of conversation between outdoor people, is now fraught with dangers. We have come to believe that the observations of others are far better than what our own eyes would tell us if we dared to look. The rising sea levels so many are scared of, are not reflected in our beach going summer days. Local beaches might grow or recede from the action of storms, but the buildings on the beach roads are still there, our spot for our towel is still the same.

Floods and fires have always been a part of this country, much of the variation is due to weather, but a lot of the increase in damage is due to us. We build in locations we never would have before. We interfere with water flows by building things in the path of the flow, raising ground levels to build more houses, putting in raised roadways with too few culverts. Each time we make a change and feel the result, they say, 'it couldn't possibly be our fault, it must be climate!' We lock up Parks and refuse to remove the dead wood or manage undergrowth properly, we again, build in areas subject to fire and then complain later of danger or damage.

Yes we are seeing fluctuations locally, but we always have. The link from that to catastrophic global impact is tenuous, each of those global stories of woe they use to scare us are more of the same fluctuations as here. Everywhere humans are, we alter things to suit us, sometimes well, sometimes not so well. We can see it at home, and if we look carefully we can see the reality, most of it is just weather! Overseas it is much the same, just weather! We are led to believe we are at fault, so it is time to tax us to fix it, yet the ‘scares’ that are brought out to make us happy to pay, keep being just that, scares – never real.

There will be those who disagree with me, and that is their right, I can only encourage people to look carefully at what is said and the actions we are expected to take to ‘fix things’. If those doing the scaring are still buying beachfront mansions, then - I’ve got a bridge to sell you!

Much of what passes for **cognitive dissonance** can be linked to political direction. An unwilling population, unwilling to put up with increasing controls over us, must be convinced to do so by something that is basically untrue! It goes against the nature of man to be limited, to accept the loss of inherent freedoms; therefore, we must be tricked into it. Enough reality must be included to gain our attention, but our lack of education or historical context, is then used to

build on it. The trick, whatever it is, also sometimes demonises one side, the side they don't want looked into. It stops us from looking. Only by learning about things can we counter it, the abuse we cop when we say we are 'doing our own research'(as though that is a bad thing), is done to stop this education. To disempower us! We must engage our enquiring nature, and ask questions each and every time a politician or public official tells us something is 'for your own good, just do it'.

Like communities of the past who had little education, we must be diligent, we must improve our own education, lest the snake oil salesmen and the con-men take away our freedoms as well, not just our money.

Make it a habit to second guess, to look for an ulterior motive. Our country is not going downhill by sheer accident. Eric Butler used to talk of the 'Village Idiot' version of history, where it all just happens. If you threw a coin for every political decision made, you would get at least half right! We have supposedly educated officials, yet even this 'half right' example seems a stretch to me. I would've thought the bias in the game would've been to our advantage, a bit at least. So what is really going on, whose bias is winning? Who should be advantaged?

If Australia is meant to be managed to benefit us, as shareholders, then we need to change the managers. A complete change, not just the swapping of one set of suits for another. We need to look for real truth and honesty in candidates, if they cannot give a straight answer to the most basic of questions, like who is a woman, or some other politically correct challenge you may level at them, then move on to the next candidate – who wants another wind-sock?

People are waking up to this need for change. The real manipulators are beginning to appear in everyday conversation. The role of global think tanks and policy makers are fast becoming known, and known as the ones to benefit most, more so than the people they are looking to control. The New World Order is no longer a fringe conspiracy theory. Mentioned by leaders across many continents and the message of 'reform' for an 'improved world' is couched in political spin which speaks of the same outcomes, no matter the language spoken.

Back in the late 1980s, Jeremy Lee and Eric Butler both spoke at length of these global economic agendas. The intention of some for that very 'New World Order' and the rise of the Agenda 21, 23 etc arising from the WEF (which is still being pushed - albeit now Agenda 2030).

Their talks can still be found in our archives and make a good start to recognising the pattern of implementation that is still occurring. Further podcasts by others also mention the history of this global development of control.

A recent compilation of 'Forgotten History' episodes is also a good primer to make that start. I suggest you watch both the old and the new as they take you through the real history of political development and who pulls the strings of that management we need to change. Knowing what questions need to be asked of the potential replacements for our failed government is crucial if we are not to repeat the same mistakes. ***

Eric Butler: *The Planned Surrender of Australia.*

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=X6neEWS5HyE>

Jeremy Lee: What is the New World Order.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=E45SLf5kiA>

Forgotten History: RISE of the New World Order.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Hwlmxn0z41w>


“

We are endeavouring to bring to birth a NEW CIVILISATION. We are doing something which really extends far beyond the confines of a change in the financial system.

We are hoping by various means, chiefly financial, to enable the human community to definitely step out of one type of civilisation into another type of civilisation, and the first and basic requirement as we see it, of that, is absolute economic security.”

C.H. Douglas

Major C.H. Douglas Speaks (1933)



thepeoplescredit.com.au | socred.org | C.H. DOUGLAS (1879 – 1952) | SCE-32

Annual Subscription to 'On Target' \$75.00 pa which includes an Insert, the On Target and the NewTimes Survey journals - printed and posted monthly.

Postal Address: PO Box 27, Happy Valley, SA 5159.
Telephone: 08 8322 8923 eMail: heritagebooks@alor.org

Online Bookstore : <https://veritasbooks.com.au/>
Our main website of the Douglas Social Credit and the Freedom Movement "Archives" :: <https://alor.org/>
On Target is printed and authorised by Arnis J. Luks
13 Carsten Court, Happy Valley, SA.